arXiv:1206.1975v1 [math.FA] 9 Jun 2012

Weighted Shift Matrices: Unitary Equivalence, Reducibility and Numerical Ranges

Hwa-Long Gau[a], **Ming-Cheng Tsai**[b], **Han-Chun Wang**[a]

[a]Department of Mathematics, National Central University, Chungli 32001, Taiwan
[b]Department of Applied Mathematics, National Sun Yat-sen University, Kaohsiung 804, Taiwan

Abstract.

An n-by-n ($n \geq 3$) weighted shift matrix A is one of the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & a_1 & & \\ & 0 & \ddots & \\ & & \ddots & a_{n-1} \\ a_n & & & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

where the a_j's, called the weights of A, are complex numbers. Assume that all a_j's are nonzero and B is an n-by-n weighted shift matrix with weights $b_1, \ldots, b_n$. We show that B is unitarily equivalent to A if and only if $b_1 \cdots b_n = a_1 \cdots a_n$ and, for some fixed k, $1 \leq k \leq n$, $|b_j| = |a_{k+j}|$ ($a_{n+j} \equiv a_j$) for all j. Next, we show that A is reducible if and only if A has periodic weights, that is, for some fixed k, $1 \leq k \leq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$, n is divisible by k, and $|a_j| = |a_{k+j}|$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n-k$. Finally, we prove that A and B have the same numerical range if and only if $a_1 \cdots a_n = b_1 \cdots b_n$ and $S_r(|a_1|^2, \ldots, |a_n|^2) = S_r(|b_1|^2, \ldots, |b_n|^2)$ for all $1 \leq r \leq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$, where S_r's are the circularly symmetric functions.

Mathematics subject classification (2010): 15A60.

Keywords and phrases: Numerical range, reducibility, weighted shift matrices.

Email address: hlgau@math.ncu.edu.tw (H.-L. Gau); mctsai2@gmail.com (M.-C. Tsai); 942401005@cc.ncu.edu.tw (H.-C. Wang).

[a]Research supported in part by the National Science Council of the Republic of China under project NSC 100-2115-M-008-004.

1. Introduction

An n-by-n ($n \geq 3$) weighted shift matrix A is one of the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & a_1 & & \\ & 0 & \ddots & \\ & & \ddots & a_{n-1} \\ a_n & & & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

where the a_j's, called the weights of A, are complex numbers. In this paper, we study some unitary-equivalence properties of such matrices. Previous works in this respect are the necessary and sufficient conditions for the boundary of numerical range of A to have a line segment [6, Theorem 1]. Here we consider other properties of these matrices such as their reducibility and their numerical range.

In Section 2, we give necessary and sufficient conditions for two n-by-n weighted shift matrices A and B with weights $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ and $b_1, \ldots, b_n$, respectively, to be unitarily equivalent. More specifically, it is shown that if A has at most two zero weights, then B is unitarily equivalent to A if and only if, for some fixed k, $1 \leq k \leq n$, $|b_j| = |a_{k+j}|$ ($a_{n+j} \equiv a_j$) for all $1 \leq j \leq n$, and $a_1 \cdots a_n = b_1 \cdots b_n$. In Section 3 below, we solve the problem when a weighted shift matrix is reducible, that is, when it is unitarily equivalent to the direct sum of two other matrices. We obtain a complete characterization of reducibility in terms of the weights. It roughly says that a weighted shift matrix is reducible when it has at least two zero weights or its weights are periodic. We take up the numerical ranges of weighted shift matrices in Section 4. We have known that the numerical range of an n-by-n matrix A is completely determined by its Kippenhahn polynomial $p_A(x, y, z) = \det(x\mathrm{Re}\, A + y\mathrm{Im}\, A + zI_n)$, where $\mathrm{Re}\, A = (A+A^*)/2$ and $\mathrm{Im}\, A = (A-A^*)/(2i)$ are the real and the imaginary part of A, respectively, and I_n denotes the n-by-n identity matrix (cf. [3, Theorem 10]). We give an explicit expansion of $p_A(x, y, z)$ in terms of the weights of an n-by-n weighted shift matrix A. Finally, let A and B be n-by-n weighted shift matrices with weights

$a_1, \ldots, a_n$ and $b_1, \ldots, b_n$, respectively, we give necessary and sufficient conditions for A and B to have the same numerical range. More specifically, it is shown that the following statements are equivalent: (a) $W(A) = W(B)$; (b) $p_A(x, y, z) = p_B(x, y, z)$; (c) $a_1 \cdots a_n = b_1 \cdots b_n$ and $S_r(|a_1|^2, \ldots, |a_n|^2) = S_r(|b_1|^2, \ldots, |b_n|^2)$ for all $1 \leq r \leq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$, where S_r's are the circularly symmetric functions (see [7, P. 496]) for more details).

For any nonzero complex number $z = x + iy$ (x and y real), $\arg z$ is the angle θ, $0 \leq \theta < 2\pi$, from the positive x-axis to the vector (x, y). For an n-by-n matrix A, let A^* denote its adjoint and $\sigma(A)$ its spectrum. Throughout this paper, if $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ are the weights of an n-by-n weighted shift matrix, we always assume that $a_{n+j} \equiv a_j$ and $a_{j-n} \equiv a_j$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n$.

2. Unitary equivalence

In [6], the authors gave sufficient conditions for unitary equivalence of two n-by-n weighted shift matrices (cf. [6, Lemma 2]). For the convenience of the reader we repeat this result without proofs, thus making our exposition self-contained.

Lemma 2.1. **[6]** *Let A and B be n-by-n weighted shift matrices with weights $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ and $b_1, \ldots, b_n$, respectively.*

(a) *If, for some fixed k, $1 \leq k \leq n$, $b_j = a_{k+j}$ ($a_{n+j} \equiv a_j$) for all j, then A is unitarily equivalent to B.*

(b) *If $|a_j| = |b_j|$ for all j, then A is unitarily equivalent to $e^{i\psi_k} B$, where $\psi_k = (2k\pi + \sum_{j=1}^{n} (\arg a_j - \arg b_j))/n$ for $0 \leq k < n$.*

Let A and B be n-by-n weighted shift matrices with weights $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ and $b_1, \ldots, b_n$, respectively. It is natural to ask whether the converse of Lemma 2.1 (a) is true. In this section, we give the affirmative answer and show that if A has at most two zero weights, then A is unitarily equivalent to B if and only if, for some fixed k, $1 \leq k \leq n$, $|b_j| = |a_{k+j}|$ $(a_{n+j} \equiv a_j)$ for all j, and $a_1 \cdots a_n = b_1 \cdots b_n$. We first give necessary conditions for unitary equivalence of two n-by-n weighted shift matrices in the next proposition.

Proposition 2.2. *Let A and B be n-by-n weighted shift matrices with weights $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ and $b_1, \ldots, b_n$, respectively. If A is unitarily equivalent to B, then the following statements hold.*

(a) $\{|a_1|, |a_2|, \ldots, |a_n|\} = \{|b_1|, |b_2|, \ldots, |b_n|\}$ (*counting multiplicities*).

(b) $a_1 \cdots a_n = b_1 \cdots b_n$.

(c) *If $a_l \cdots a_m \neq 0$ for some l and m, $1 \leq l \leq m \leq n$, then there exists a fixed k, $1 \leq k \leq n$, such that $|a_j| = |b_{k+j}|$ $(b_{n+j} \equiv b_j)$ for $j = l-1, l, \ldots, m+1$.*

Proof. (a) A simple computation shows that $AA^* = \text{diag}\,(|a_1|^2, \ldots, |a_n|^2)$ and $BB^* = \text{diag}\,(|b_1|^2, \ldots, |b_n|^2)$. Thus the singular values of A (resp., B) are $|a_1|, \ldots, |a_n|$ (resp., $|b_1|, \ldots, |b_n|$). Since A is unitarily equivalent to B, A and B have the same singular values, hence $\{|a_1|, |a_2|, \ldots, |a_n|\} = \{|b_1|, |b_2|, \ldots, |b_n|\}$ (counting multiplicities) as desired.

(b) An easy computation shows that $\det A = (-1)^{n+1} a_1 \cdots a_n$ and $\det B = (-1)^{n+1} b_1 \cdots b_n$. Since A is unitarily equivalent to B, hence $\det A = \det B$ or $b_1 \cdots b_n = a_1 \cdots a_n$ as asserted.

(c) From Lemma 2.1 (a), we may assume that $l = 1$. By assumption, there exists an n-by-n unitary matrix $U = [u_{ij}]_{i,j=1}^n$ such that $AU = UB$. It follows that $(A^j A^{j*})U = U(B^j B^{j*})$ for all j, $1 \leq j \leq n$. A direct computation shows that $A^j A^{j*} = \text{diag}\,(\alpha_1^{(j)}, \ldots, \alpha_n^{(j)})$ and $B^j B^{j*} = \text{diag}\,(\beta_1^{(j)}, \ldots, \beta_n^{(j)})$, where $\alpha_t^{(j)} = |a_t a_{t+1} \cdots a_{t+j-1}|^2$ and $\beta_t^{(j)} = |b_t b_{t+1} \cdots b_{t+j-1}|^2$ for all $1 \leq t, j \leq n$. Since U is unitary, then the first row of U must have a nonzero entry, that is, $u_{1k} \neq 0$ for some k, $1 \leq k \leq n$. Now, we consider the $(1,k)$-entry of $(A^j A^{j*})U$ and $U(B^j B^{j*})$, respectively. Note that the $(1,k)$-entry of $(A^jA^{j*})U$ (resp., $U(B^jB^{j*})$) is $\alpha_1^{(j)}u_{1k}$ (resp., $u_{1k}\beta_k^{(j)}$) for $j = 1, 2, \cdots, n$. Since $(A^jA^{j*})U = U(B^jB^{j*})$, we obtain

$$|a_1a_2\cdots a_j|^2u_{1k} = \alpha_1^{(j)}u_{1k} = u_{1k}\beta_k^{(j)} = u_{1k}|b_kb_{k+1}\cdots b_{k+j-1}|^2 \tag{1}$$

for all j. For $j = 1$, since $u_{1k} \neq 0$, we deduce that $|a_1| = |b_k|$ from Equation (1). For $j = 2$, since $u_{1k} \neq 0$ and $|b_k| = |a_1| \neq 0$, by Equation (1), we infer that $|a_2| = |b_{k+1}|$. Repeating this argument gives us $|a_t| = |b_{(k-1)+t}|$ for $t = 1, 2, \ldots, m+1$. On the other hand, since $A^*A = \text{diag}\ (|a_n|^2, |a_1|^2 \ldots, |a_{n-1}|^2)$, $B^*B = \text{diag}\ (|b_n|^2, |b_1|^2, \ldots, |b_{n-1}|^2)$ and $(A^*A)U = U(B^*B)$, then $|a_n|^2u_{1k} = u_{1k}|b_{k-1}|^2$ or $|a_n| = |b_{k-1}|$. This completes the proof. ■

The following theorem is our main result in this section.

Theorem 2.3. Let A and B be n-by-n weighted shift matrices with weights $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ and $b_1, \ldots, b_n$, *respectively. Suppose that* A *has at most two zero weights. Then* A *is unitarily equivalent to* B *if and only if* $a_1 \cdots a_n = b_1 \cdots b_n$ *and, for some fixed* k, $1 \leq k \leq n$, $|a_j| = |b_{k+j}|$ $(b_{n+j} \equiv b_j)$ *for all* j, $1 \leq j \leq n$.

Proof. The sufficiency is a consequence of Lemma 2.1 (a) and (b), we only need prove the necessity. Clearly, we have $a_1 \cdots a_n = b_1 \cdots b_n$ from Proposition 2.2 (b). If all a_j's are nonzero, that is, $a_1 \cdots a_n \neq 0$, our assertion follows from Proposition 2.2 (c). If A has exactly one zero weight, by Lemma 2.1 (a), we may assume $a_n = 0$ and $a_1 \cdots a_{n-1} \neq 0$. By Proposition 2.2 (c), we have $|a_j| = |b_{k+j}|$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n$, for some fixed k, $1 \leq k \leq n$ and we are done.

Now, if A has exactly two zero weights, by Lemma 2.1 (a), we may assume that $a_1 \cdots a_{m-1} \neq 0$, $a_{m+1} \cdots a_{n-1} \neq 0$ and $a_m = a_n = 0$ for some m, $1 < m < n$. Since $a_1 \cdots a_{m-1} \neq 0$, Proposition 2.2 (c) implies that, for some fixed k, $1 \leq k \leq n$, $|a_j| = |b_{k+j}|$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m-1$, $a_n = b_k = 0$ and $a_m = b_{k+m} = 0$. For convenience, we let $b'_j = b_{k+j}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n$, and B' be the n-by-n weighted shift matrix with weights $b'_1, \ldots, b'_n$. Lemma 2.1 (a) yields that B' is unitarily equivalent to A. Moreover, we have $|b'_j| = |b_{k+j}| = |a_j|$ for $j = n, 1, \ldots, m$. Note that $b'_m = a_m = 0 = a_n = b'_n$. Now, we need only check that $|b'_j| = |a_j|$ for $j = m+1, \ldots, n-1$. Indeed, since $a_{m+1} \cdots a_{n-1} \neq 0$, by Proposition 2.2 (c), there exists a fixed s, $1 \leq s \leq n$, such that $|a_j| = |b'_{s+j}|$ for $j = m, m+1, \ldots, n$. In particular, $b'_s = b'_{s+n} = a_n = 0$ and $b'_{s+m} = a_m = 0$. Note that A has exactly two zero weights a_m and a_n, by Proposition 2.2 (a), there are also exactly two weights of B being zero. It forces that either $s = n$ or $s = m$ and $s + m = n$. If $s = n$ then $|a_j| = |b'_j|$ for all $m \leq j \leq n$ and we are done. For the latter case, it implies that $s = m = n/2$. Consequently, we have actually proved that $a_{n/2} = a_n = b'_n = b'_{n/2} = 0$ and, for each $j = 1, \ldots, n/2$, $|a_{(n/2)+j}| = |b'_{s+(n/2)+j}| = |b'_{n+j}| = |b'_j| = |a_j|$. On the other hand, since $b'_j \neq 0$ for all $j = (n/2)+1, \ldots, n-1$, Proposition 2.2 (c) yields that there exists a fixed t, $1 \leq t \leq n$, such that $|b'_j| = |a_{t+j}|$ for $j = n/2, \ldots, n$. It implies that $a_{t+(n/2)} = b'_{n/2} = 0 = b'_n = a_{t+n} = a_t$. But the zero weights of A are exactly $a_{n/2}$ and a_n, we infer that either $t = n$ or $t = n/2$. If $t = n$ then $|b'_j| = |a_{n+j}| = |a_j|$ for $j = n/2, \ldots, n$, as asserted. For the latter case, $t = n/2$ implies that $|b'_j| = |a_{(n/2)+j}| = |a_j|$ for $j = n/2, \ldots, n$. This completes the proof. ■

We remark that if A has more than two zero weights, then the necessity of Theorem 2.2 is not true in general. For example, let A be the 6-by-6 weighted shift matrix with weights $1, 0, 2, 0, 3, 0$. Then $A = A_1 \oplus A_2 \oplus A_3$, where $A_j = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & j \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ for $j = 1, 2, 3$. Let $B = A_1 \oplus A_3 \oplus A_2$, then B is the 6-by-6 weighted shift matrix with weights $1, 0, 3, 0, 2, 0$. It is obvious that A is unitarily equivalent to B, but there is no any k, $1 \leq k \leq 6$, such that $|a_j| = |b_{k+j}|$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, 6$.

We now consider the case of weighted shift matrices with at least three zero weights. Let A be an n-by-n weighted shift matrices with weights $a_1, \ldots, a_n$. If A has at least three zero weights, by Lemma 2.1 (a) and (b), we may assume that $a_n = 0$ and $a_j \geq 0$ for all j. In this case, $A = A_1 \oplus A_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus A_m$, where A_i is a k_i-by-k_i weighted shift matrices with exactly one zero weight for all $1 \leq i \leq m$, $\sum_{i=1}^m k_i = n$ and $3 \leq m \leq n$. Note that if $k_i = 1$ then $A_i = [0]$, moreover, A_i is irreducible for all $1 \leq i \leq m$. Now, let $\tau : \{1, \ldots, m\} \to \{1, \ldots, m\}$ be a permutation and $B = A_{\tau(1)} \oplus \cdots \oplus A_{\tau(m)}$, we known that B is unitarily equivalent to A. The next theorem shows that its converse is also true, more precisely, if B be an n-by-n weighted shift matrices with nonnegative weights and B is unitarily equivalent to A, then $B = A_{\tau(1)} \oplus \cdots \oplus A_{\tau(m)}$ for some permutation $\tau : \{1, \ldots, m\} \to \{1, \ldots, m\}$.

Here, for any n-by-n matrix $A = [a_{ij}]_{i,j=1}^n$, let $|A|$ denote the n-by-n nonnegative matrix $[|a_{ij}|]_{i,j=1}^n$.

Theorem 2.4. *Let $A = A_1 \oplus A_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus A_m$, where A_i is a k_i-by-k_i weighted shift matrices with weights $a_1^{(i)}, \ldots, a_{k_i-1}^{(i)}, 0$ and $a_j^{(i)} \neq 0$ for all $1 \leq j \leq k_i - 1$ and $1 \leq i \leq m$, $\sum_{i=1}^m k_i = n$ and $3 \leq m \leq n$. Let B be an n-by-n weighted shift matrix. Then B is unitarily equivalent to A if and only if $|B| = |A_{\tau(1)}| \oplus |A_{\tau(2)}| \oplus \cdots \oplus |A_{\tau(m)}|$ for some permutation $\tau : \{1, \ldots, m\} \to \{1, \ldots, m\}$.*

For the proof of Theorem 2.4, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 2.5. *Let A (resp., B) be an m-by-m (resp., n-by-n) weighted shift matrix with weights $a_1, \ldots, a_{m-1}, 0$ (resp., $b_1, \ldots, b_{n-1}, 0$), where $a_i, b_j > 0$ for all i, j. If U is an m-by-n matrix so that $A^k U = U B^k$ and $A^{*k} U = U B^{*k}$ for all $k \geq 0$, then the following statements hold.*

(a) *If $m \neq n$ then $U = 0$.*

(b) *If $m = n$ then U is a diagonal matrix.*

(c) *If $m = n$ and $A \neq B$, then $U = 0$.*

(d) *If $m = n$ and $A = B$, then $U = \alpha I_n$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$.*

Proof. By assumption, we have $(A^k A^{*k})U = U(B^k B^{*k})$ and $(A^{*k} A^k)U = U(B^{*k} B^k)$ for all $k \geq 0$. Let $U = [u_{ij}]$ and $r = \min\{m, n\}$. For $1 \leq i < j \leq r$, we consider the (i, j)-entry of $(A^{*i} A^i)U$ and $U(B^{*i} B^i)$, respectively. By a direct computation, we have

$$A^{*i}A^i = \operatorname{diag}(\underbrace{0,\ldots,0}_{i \text{ copies}}, |a_1\cdots a_i|^2, \ldots, |a_{m-i}\cdots a_{m-1}|^2)$$

and

$$B^{*i}B^i = \operatorname{diag}(\underbrace{0,\ldots,0}_{i \text{ copies}}, |b_1\cdots b_i|^2, \ldots, |b_{n-i}\cdots b_{n-1}|^2).$$

Thus the (i,j)-entry of $(A^{*i}A^i)U$ and $U(B^{*i}B^i)$ are 0 and $u_{ij}|b_{j-i}\cdots b_{j-1}|^2$, respectively. Since $(A^{*i}A^i)U = U(B^{*i}B^i)$ and $b_{j-i}\cdots b_{j-1} \neq 0$, we deduce that $u_{ij} = 0$ for all $1 \le i < j \le r$. On the other hand, for $1 \le j < i \le r$, the (i,j)-entry of $(A^{*j}A^j)U$ and $U(B^{*j}B^j)$ are $u_{ij}|a_{i-j}\cdots a_{i-1}|^2$ and 0, respectively. Since $(A^{*j}A^j)U = U(B^{*j}B^j)$ and $a_{i-j}\cdots a_{i-1} \neq 0$, we deduce that $u_{ij} = 0$ for all $1 \le j < i \le r$. Therefore, if $m = n$ then U is a diagonal matrix. This completes the proof of (b).

For the other cases, if $r = n < m$, then $B^n = 0$ and $U(B^{*n}B^n) = 0$. But

$$A^{*n}A^n = \operatorname{diag}(\underbrace{0,\ldots,0}_{n \text{ copies}}, |a_1\cdots a_n|^2, \ldots, |a_{m-n}\cdots a_{m-1}|^2),$$

since $(A^{*n}A^n)U = U(B^{*n}B^n) = 0$ and all a_j's are nonzero, we obtain that $u_{ij} = 0$ for all $n < i \le m$ and $1 \le j \le n$. We now check that $u_{ii} = 0$ for all $1 \le i \le n$. Indeed, for $1 \le i \le n$, by a direct computation, we have

$$A^iA^{*i} = \operatorname{diag}(|a_1\cdots a_i|^2, \ldots, |a_{m-i}\cdots a_{m-1}|^2, \underbrace{0,\ldots,0}_{i \text{ copies}})$$

and

$$B^iB^{*i} = \operatorname{diag}(|b_1\cdots b_i|^2, \ldots, |b_{n-i}\cdots b_{n-1}|^2, \underbrace{0,\ldots,0}_{i \text{ copies}}).$$

Then the $(n-i+1, n-i+1)$-entry of $(A^iA^{*i})U$ and $U(B^iB^{*i})$ are $|a_{n-i+1}\cdots a_n|^2 u_{n-i+1,n-i+1}$ and 0, respectively. Since $(A^iA^{*i})U = U(B^iB^{*i}B^i)$ and $a_{n-i+1}\cdots a_n \neq 0$, it forces that $u_{ii} = 0$ for all $1 \le i \le n$, hence we conclude that $U = 0$. Similarly, if $r = m < n$, then $A^m = 0$ and $(A^{*m}A^m)U = 0$. But

$$B^{*m}B^m = \operatorname{diag}(\underbrace{0,\ldots,0}_{m \text{ copies}}, |b_1\cdots b_m|^2, \ldots, |b_{n-m}\cdots b_{n-1}|^2),$$

since $(A^{*m}A^m)U = U(B^{*m}B^m) = 0$ and all b_j's are nonzero, we obtain that $u_{ij} = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $m < j \leq n$. Moreover, for $1 \leq i \leq m$, the $(m-i+1, m-i+1)$-entry of $(A^iA^{*i})U$ and $U(B^iB^{*i})$ are 0 and $|b_{m-i+1}\cdots b_m|^2 u_{m-i+1,m-i+1}$, respectively. Since $(A^iA^{*i})U = U(B^iB^{*i}B^i)$ and $b_{m-i+1}\cdots b_m \neq 0$, it implies that $u_{ii} = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$, hence we also obtain that $U = 0$. This completes the proof of (a).

For the proof of (c) and (d), we may assume that $m = n$ and $U = \operatorname{diag}(u_{11}, \ldots, u_{nn})$ from (b). For $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, the $(i, i+1)$-entry of AU and UB are $a_iu_{i+1,i+1}$ and b_iu_{ii}, respectively. Then $AU = UB$ yields that

$$u_{i+1,i+1} = \frac{b_i}{a_i}u_{ii} \tag{2}$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. Similarly, the $(i+1, i)$-entry of A^*U and UB^* are a_iu_{ii} and $b_iu_{i+1,i+1}$, respectively. Then $A^*U = UB^*$ yields that

$$u_{i+1,i+1} = \frac{a_i}{b_i}u_{ii} \tag{3}$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. Combining (2) with (3) yields $u_{ii} = (a_i^2/b_i^2)u_{ii}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. Now, if $A \neq B$ then $a_j \neq b_j$ for some j. Note that $a_i, b_i > 0$ for all i, thus $a_j^2/b_j^2 \neq 1$ and $u_{jj} = 0$. Consequently, we have $u_{ii} = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ by Equation (2). This completes the proof of (c). On the other hand, if $A = B$ then $a_i = b_i$ for all i, it follows that $u_{11} = u_{22} = \cdots = u_{nn}$ from Equation (2). Hence $U = u_{11}I_n$, completing the proof. ■

We are now ready to prove Theorem 2.4.

Proof of Theorem 2.4. The sufficiency follows from Lemma 2.1 (b) and a suitable permutation matrix, we only need prove the necessity. Assume that B is unitarily equivalent to A. Since A has zero weights, by Lemma 2.1 (b), we may assume that all weights of A are nonnegative. After a permutation of A_i's, we may assume that $1 \leq k_1 \leq k_2 \leq \cdots \leq k_m \leq n$. Note that $\sigma(A) = \{0\}$ and $\dim\ker A_i = 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$, the Jordan canonical form of A is $J_{k_1} \oplus J_{k_2} \oplus \cdots \oplus J_{k_m}$, where J_{k_i} is the Jordan block of size k_i for all i. This means that the number and sizes of direct summands of A are completely determined by its Jordan canonical form. Since A and B have the same Jordan canonical form, after a permutation of direct summands of B, we can write $B = B_1 \oplus B_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus B_m$, where B_i is a k_i-by-k_i weighted shift matrices with weights $b_1^{(i)}, \ldots, b_{k_i-1}^{(i)}, 0$ and $b_j^{(i)} \neq 0$ for all $1 \leq j \leq k_i - 1$ and $1 \leq i \leq m$. Moreover, by Lemma 2.1 (b), we also assume $b_j^{(i)} > 0$ for all $1 \leq j \leq k_i - 1$ and $1 \leq i \leq m$.

We need to check that $\{A_1, \ldots, A_m\} = \{B_1, \ldots, B_m\}$ (counting multiplicities). Indeed, let $U = [U_{ij}]_{i,j=1}^m$ be a n-by-n unitary block matrix so that $AU = UB$, where U_{ij} is a k_i-by-k_j matrix for all $1 \leq i, j \leq m$. For each A_i, $1 \leq i \leq m$, if $A_i \neq B_j$ for all j, $1 \leq j \leq m$, Lemma 2.5 (a) and (c) yield that $U_{ij} = 0$ for all $1 \leq j \leq m$. This contradicts to the fact that U is unitary. Thus we deduce that $\{A_1, \ldots, A_m\} \subseteq \{B_1, \ldots, B_m\}$. Similarly, if $B_j \neq A_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$, then $U_{ij} = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$, a contradiction. Hence we conclude that $\{A_1, \ldots, A_m\} = \{B_1, \ldots, B_m\}$.

Next, for each A_i, $1 \leq i \leq m$, we need to count the multiplicities of A_i in A and B, respectively. If $1 = k_1 = \cdots = k_t$ and $k_{t+1} > 1$ for some t, that is, $A_1 = \cdots = A_t = [0]$ and $A_i \neq [0]$ for all $i > t$, since the sizes of A_i and B_i are the same for all $1 \leq i \leq m$, thus $B_1 = \cdots = B_t = [0]$ and $B_i \neq [0]$ for all $i > t$. This means that $\ker A \cap \ker A^* = \ker B \cap \ker B^* = \mathbb{C}^t \oplus \{0\} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$. Since $AU = UB$ and $A^*U = UB^*$, then $U(\ker B \cap \ker B^*) = \ker A \cap \ker A^*$, it implies that $U = [U_{ij}]_{i,j=1}^t \oplus [U_{ij}]_{i,j=t+1}^m$, $[U_{ij}]_{i,j=1}^t$ and $[U_{ij}]_{i,j=t+1}^m$ are unitary, $(A_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus A_t)[U_{ij}]_{i,j=1}^t = [U_{ij}]_{i,j=1}^t (B_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus B_t)$ and $(A_{t+1} \oplus \cdots \oplus A_m)[U_{ij}]_{i,j=t+1}^m = [U_{ij}]_{i,j=t+1}^m (B_{t+1} \oplus \cdots \oplus B_m)$. Therefore, we may assume that $2 \leq k_1 \leq k_2 \leq \cdots \leq k_m$, that is, both A and B have no zero direct summand.

Next, after permutations of A_i's and B_i's, respectively, we may assume that $A_1 = A_2 = \cdots = A_s$, $A_i \neq A_1$ for all $i > s$, $B_1 = B_2 = \cdots = B_r = A_1$ and $B_j \neq A_1$ for all

$j > r$. We want to show $s = r$. Indeed, Lemma 2.5 (a), (c) and (d) yield

$$U = \left[\begin{array}{ccc|c} \alpha_{11}I_{k_1} & \cdots & \alpha_{1r}I_{k_1} & \\ \vdots & & \vdots & 0 \\ \alpha_{s1}I_{k_1} & \cdots & \alpha_{sr}I_{k_1} & \\ \hline & 0 & & U' \end{array}\right],$$

where α_{ij}'s are complex numbers and U' is a $(n - sk_1)$-by-$(n - rk_1)$ matrix. Since U is unitary, the column vectors and the row vectors of U are orthonormal, respectively, it forces that $s = r$. Therefore, we conclude that $A_1 = \cdots = A_s = B_1 = \cdots = B_s$, $A_i, B_i \neq A_1$ for all $i > s$, U' is unitary and $(A_{s+1} \oplus \cdots \oplus A_m)U' = U'(B_{s+1} \oplus \cdots \oplus B_m)$. Repeating this argument gives us $\{A_1, \ldots, A_m\} = \{B_1, \ldots, B_m\}$ (counting multiplicities). This completes the proof. ■

3. Reducibility

A matrix is *reducible* if it is unitarily equivalent to the direct sum of two other matrices. Let A be an n-by-n weighted shift matrix with weights $a_1, \ldots, a_n$. In [6], the author shown that A is reducible if and only if one of the following cases holds: (a) $a_i = a_j = 0$ for some $1 \leq i < j \leq n$, (b) n is odd, $|a_j| = |a_1| \neq 0$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n$, (c) n is even, $|a_j| = |a_{j+(n/2)}| \neq 0$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n/2$. Unfortunately, this result is erroneous. For example, let A be the 6-by-6 weighted shift matrix with weights $1, 2, 1, 2, 1, 2$. It is obvious that A does not satisfy the conditions (a), (b) and (c). Let U be the 6-by-6 unitary matrix

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & \omega & 0 & \omega^2 \\ 1 & 0 & \omega^2 & 0 & \omega^4 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & \omega^3 & 0 & \omega^6 \\ 1 & 0 & \omega^4 & 0 & \omega^8 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & \omega^5 & 0 & \omega^{10} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\omega = e^{i\pi/3}$. A direct computation shows that

$$U^*AU = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 2 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \omega \\ 2\omega & 0 \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \omega^2 \\ 2\omega^2 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Hence A is reducible.

In this section, we give a criterion for a weighted shift matrix A to be reducible. We will show that A is reducible if and only if one of the following cases holds: (a) $a_i = a_j = 0$ for some $1 \le i < j \le n$, (b) A has periodic weights.

We first consider the weighted shift matrices with nonzero weights.

Theorem 3.1. *Let A be an n-by-n weighted shift matrix with nonzero weights $a_1, \ldots, a_n$. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

(a) *A is reducible.*

(b) *A has periodic weights, that is, for some fixed k, $1 \le k \le \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$, n is divisible by k, and $|a_j| = |a_{k+j}|$ for all $1 \le j \le n-k$.*

(c) *there exists a fixed k, $1 \le k \le \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$, such that n is divisible by k and A is unitarily equivalent to $e^{i\theta}\left(B \oplus (\omega B) \oplus \cdots \oplus (\omega^{(n/k)-1}B)\right)$, where B is the k-by-k weighted shift matrix with weights $|a_1|, \ldots, |a_k|$, $\omega = e^{2\pi i/n}$ and $\theta = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \arg a_j\right)/n$.*

Proof. (a)$\Rightarrow$(b). Since A is reducible, there exists an n-by-n orthogonal projection $P = [p_{ij}]_{i,j=1}^n$ such that $PA = AP$. It follows that $PA^* = A^*P$, consequently, $P(A^kA^{k*}) = (A^kA^{k*})P$ for all k.

On the contrary, suppose that the weights of A are not periodic. We claim that for any $1 \le i < j \le n$, there exists k_0, $1 \le k_0 \le n$, such that $|a_ia_{i+1}\cdots a_{i+(k_0-1)}| \ne |a_ja_{j+1}\cdots a_{j+(k_0-1)}|$ ($a_{n+t} \equiv a_t$). Indeed, if there exist i_0 and j_0, $1 \le i_0 < j_0 \le n$, such that $|a_{i_0}\cdots a_{i_0+k}| = |a_{j_0}\cdots a_{j_0+k}|$ for all $0 \le k \le n-1$, then $|a_{i_0+k}| = |a_{j_0+k}|$ for all $0 \le k \le n-1$, that is, $|a_t| = |a_{t+(j_0-i_0)}|$ for all $1 \le t \le n$. This implies that A has periodic weights, a contradiction. Therefore, for any $1 \le i < j \le n$, we have $|a_i a_{i+1} \cdots a_{i+(k-1)}| \neq |a_j a_{j+1} \cdots a_{j+(k-1)}|$ for some k. Note that $A^k A^{k*} = \text{diag}\ (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n)$ where $\alpha_t = |a_t a_{t+1} \cdots a_{t+(k-1)}|^2$ for all $1 \leq t \leq n$, and the (i,j)-entry of $(A^k A^{k*})P$ and $P(A^k A^{k*})$ are $\alpha_i p_{ij}$ and $p_{ij}\alpha_j$, respectively. Since $(A^k A^{k*})P = P(A^k A^{k*})$ and all a_j's are nonzero, hence $\alpha_i p_{ij} = p_{ij}\alpha_j$ or $p_{ij} = 0$. From this and $P = P^*$, we conclude that P is a diagonal matrix, that is, $P = \text{diag}\ (p_{11}, \ldots, p_{nn})$ and $p_{jj} = 0$ or 1 for all $1 \leq j \leq n$. Moreover, $AP - PA = 0$ implies that $a_1(p_{11} - p_{22}) = a_2(p_{22} - p_{33}) = \cdots = a_n(p_{nn} - p_{11}) = 0$, since all a_j's are nonzero, we deduce that $P = 0$ or $P = I_n$. This contradicts the fact that A is reducible. Therefore, A has periodic weights.

(b)⇒(c). Let $\tilde{A}$ be the n-by-n weighted shift matrix with weights $|a_1|, |a_2|, \ldots, |a_n|$. By Lemma 2.1 (b), we obtain that A is unitarily equivalent to $e^{i\theta}\tilde{A}$, where $\theta = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \arg a_j\right)/n$. We want to construct an n-by-n unitary matrix U such that $U^*\tilde{A}U = B \oplus \omega B \oplus \cdots \oplus \omega^{m-1}B$ where $\omega = e^{2\pi i/n}$, $m = n/k$ and B is the k-by-k weighted shift matrix with weights $|a_1|, \ldots, |a_k|$. Let $V_j = \text{diag}\ (1, \omega^j, \omega^{2j}, \ldots, \omega^{(k-1)j})$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m-1$ and U be the n-by-n matrix

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\begin{bmatrix} I_k & V_1 & V_2 & \cdots & V_{m-1} \\ I_k & \omega^k V_1 & (\omega^2)^k V_2 & \cdots & (\omega^{m-1})^k V_{m-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ I_k & \omega^{(m-1)k} V_1 & (\omega^2)^{(m-1)k} V_2 & \cdots & (\omega^{m-1})^{(m-1)k} V_{m-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

We now check that U is unitary. Indeed, for any $1 \leq s,t \leq m$, the (s,t)-block of UU^* is

$$\frac{1}{m}\begin{bmatrix} I_k & \omega^{(s-1)k}V_1 & \omega^{2(s-1)k}V_2 & \cdots & \omega^{(m-1)(s-1)k}V_{m-1} \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} I_k \\ \bar{\omega}^{(t-1)k}V_1^* \\ \bar{\omega}^{2(t-1)k}V_2^* \\ \vdots \\ \bar{\omega}^{(m-1)(t-1)k}V_{m-1}^* \end{bmatrix}$$

$$= \frac{1}{m}\left(\sum_{l=0}^{m-1} \omega^{l(s-t)k}\right) I_k.$$

If $s = t$, then $\sum_{l=0}^{m-1} \omega^{l(s-t)k} = m$. On the other hand, if $s \neq t$, then

$$\sum_{l=0}^{m-1} (\omega^{(s-t)k})^l = \frac{1 - \omega^{(s-t)km}}{1 - \omega^{(s-t)k}} = \frac{1 - e^{2(s-t)\pi i}}{1 - \omega^{(s-t)k}} = 0.$$

Thus $UU^* = I_n$ or U is unitary.

Next, we check that $U(B \oplus \omega B \oplus \cdots \oplus \omega^{m-1} B)U^* = \tilde{A}$. Write $B = B_1 + B_2$ where B_1 (resp., B_2) is the k-by-k weighted shift matrix with weights $|a_1|, \ldots, |a_{k-1}|, 0$ (resp., $0, \ldots, 0, |a_k|$). A simple computation shows that $V_j B V_j^* = \omega^{-j} B_1 + \omega^{(k-1)j} B_2$ for all $1 \leq j \leq m-1$. For any $1 \leq s, t \leq m$, the (s,t)-block of $U(B \oplus \cdots \oplus \omega^{m-1} B)U^*$ is

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{m} \begin{bmatrix} B & \omega^{(s-1)k} V_1(\omega B) & \cdots & \omega^{(m-1)(s-1)k} V_{m-1}(\omega^{m-1} B) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I_k \\ \bar{\omega}^{(t-1)k} V_1^* \\ \vdots \\ \bar{\omega}^{(m-1)(t-1)k} V_{m-1}^* \end{bmatrix} \\
= \; & \frac{1}{m} \left(B + \omega^{(s-t)k+1} V_1 B V_1^* + \omega^{2((s-t)k+1)} V_2 B V_2^* + \cdots + \omega^{(m-1)((s-t)k+1)} V_{m-1} B V_{m-1}^* \right) \\
= \; & \frac{1}{m} \left(\sum_{l=0}^{m-1} \omega^{l(s-t)k} \right) B_1 + \frac{1}{m} \left(\sum_{l=0}^{m-1} \omega^{l(s-t+1)k} \right) B_2 \\
= \; & \frac{1}{m} \left(\sum_{l=0}^{m-1} e^{2l(s-t)\pi i/m} \right) B_1 + \frac{1}{m} \left(\sum_{l=0}^{m-1} e^{2l(s-t+1)\pi i/m} \right) B_2 \\
= \; & \begin{cases} B_1 & \text{if } 1 \leq s = t \leq m, \\ B_2 & \text{if } (s,t) = (m,1) \text{ or } t = s+1, 1 \leq s \leq m-1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

¿From above, we obtain

$$U(B \oplus \omega B \oplus \cdots \oplus \omega^{m-1} B)U^* = \begin{bmatrix} B_1 & B_2 & & \\ & B_1 & \ddots & \\ & & \ddots & B_2 \\ B_2 & & & B_1 \end{bmatrix} = \tilde{A}$$

as required.

(c)$\Rightarrow$(a). This implication is trivial. $\blacksquare$

Let A be an n-by-n weighted shift matrix with weights $a_1, \ldots, a_n$. The next proposition shows that if A has exactly one zero weight, then A is irreducible.

Proposition 3.2. *Let A be an n-by-n weighted shift matrix with weights $a_1, \ldots, a_{n-1}, 0$, where $a_j \neq 0$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n-1$. Then A is irreducible.*

Proof. Let $\{e_1, \ldots, e_n\}$ be the standard basis for $\mathbb{C}^n$, and M be a nontrivial reducing subspace of A. We want to show that $M = \mathbb{C}^n$. Indeed, let $x = [x_1 \ \ldots \ x_n]^T$ be a nonzero vector in M, and x_{j_0} be the first nonzero entry of x. Then $A^{*(n-j_0)}x = \bar{a}_{j_0}\bar{a}_{j_0+1} \cdots \bar{a}_{n-1}x_{j_0}e_n$, it follows that $e_n \in M$. Consequently, we have $A^j e_n \in M$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, n-1$. Since $A^j e_n = a_{n-j}a_{n-j+1} \cdots a_{n-1}e_{n-j}$ for $j = 1, \ldots, n-1$, hence $\{e_1, \ldots, e_n\} \subseteq M$ and A is irreducible. $\blacksquare$

We now give a complete characterization of n-by-n weighted shift matrices A which are reducible.

Corollary 3.3. *Let A be an n-by-n $(n \geq 2)$ weighted shift matrix with weights $a_1, \ldots, a_n$. Then A is reducible if and only if one of the following cases hold:*

(a) *$a_i = a_j = 0$ for some $1 \leq i < j \leq n$,*

(b) *A has periodic weights.*

Proof. Assume that A is reducible. From Proposition 3.2, we infer that either there are at least two weights of A being zero, or all a_j's are nonzero. Therefore, A is either in case (a) or in case (b) from Theorem 3.1.

To prove the converse, we first assume that $a_i = a_j = 0$ for some i, j, $1 \leq i < j \leq n$. By Lemma 2.1 (a), we may assume that $j = n$ and $1 < i < n$. Then $A = A_1 \oplus A_2$, where A_1 and A_2 are the weighted shift matrices with weights $a_1, \ldots, a_{i-1}, 0$ and $a_{i+1}, \ldots, a_{n-1}, 0$, respectively. This shows that A is reducible. For case (b), if all a_j's are nonzero, then our assertion follows from Theorem 3.1. If $a_j = 0$ for some j, since A has periodic weights, then $a_{k+j} = a_j = 0$ for some k, $1 \leq k \leq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$. Hence A is reducible from case (a). This completes the proof. $\blacksquare$

We conclude this section by remarking that [5, Theorem 1 (a)] is an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.1.

4. Numerical ranges

Recall that the *numerical range* of an n-by-n matrix A is by definition the set $W(A) = \{\langle Ax, x\rangle : x \in \mathbb{C}^n, \|x\| = 1\}$, where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and $\| \cdot \|$ denote, respectively, the standard inner product and Euclidean norm in $\mathbb{C}^n$. The numerical range is a nonempty compact convex subset of the complex plane. It is invariant under unitary equivalence and contains the eigenvalues. For other properties of the numerical range, the reader can consult [2, Chapter 1].

In recent years, properties of the numerical ranges of weighted shift matrices have been intensely studied (cf. [5, 6, 7]). It was obtained that the numerical range of an n-by-n weighted shift matrix A has the n-symmetry property, that is, $W(A) = e^{2\pi i/n} W(A)$ (cf. [4, Theorem 2.3]). Moreover, if A has at least one zero weight, then $W(A)$ is a circular disc centered at the origin. In this case, Stout [7] gave a formula for the radius of the circular disc $W(A)$. His formula involves the circularly symmetric functions. In this section, we will give the expansion of the Kippenhahn polynomial of A in terms of the circularly symmetric functions. Therefore, here we give a brief review of the circularly symmetric functions, following Stout [7].

Let $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ be complex numbers and r be a nonnegative integer. S_0 is defined to be 1, while for $r \geq 1$, $S_r(a_1, \ldots, a_n) = \sum \left\{ \prod_{k=1}^{r} a_{\pi(k)} | \pi : (1, \ldots, r) \to (1, \ldots, n), \right.$ where $\pi(k) + 1 < \pi(k+1)$ for $1 \leq k < r$, and if $\pi(1) = 1$ then $\left. \pi(r) \neq n \right\}$. These have a nice description: imagine a regular n-gon with vertices labeled a_1 through a_n.

Draw a convex r-gon in it, with vertices among the a_j with the restriction that it can not use an edge of the original polygon. Each term in $S_r(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ is the product of the vertices of such an r-gon.

These functions satisfy many identities. By [7, P. 496], we have the following:

(4.1) $S_1(a_1, \ldots, a_n) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} a_k$ if $n > 1$,

(4.2) $S_r(a_1, \ldots, a_n) = 0$ if $r > n/2$,

(4.3) $S_r(a_1, \ldots, a_n) = S_r(a_2, \ldots, a_n, a_1)$,

(4.4) $S_r(a_1, \ldots, a_n, 0) = S_r(a_1, \ldots, a_n, 0, 0)$,

(4.5) $S_{r+1}(a_1, \ldots, a_{n+1}, 0) = S_{r+1}(a_1, \ldots, a_n, 0) + a_{n+1} S_r(a_1, \ldots, a_{n-1}, 0)$.

In particular, we need the following identities.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $S_r(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ be the circularly symmetric function defined as above. Then*

(a) $S_r(a_1, \ldots, a_n, 0) = S_r(a_2, \ldots, a_n, 0) + a_1 S_{r-1}(a_3, \ldots, a_n, 0)$, *and*

(b) $S_r(a_1, \ldots, a_n) = S_r(a_1, \ldots, a_n, 0) - a_1 a_n S_{r-2}(a_3, \ldots, a_{n-2}, 0)$.

Proof. By the definition of the circularly symmetric function, it is clear that

$$\begin{aligned} & S_r(a_1, \ldots, a_n, 0) \\ = & \sum \left\{ \prod_{k=1}^{r} a_{\pi(k)} | \pi : (1, \ldots, r) \to (1, \ldots, n), \text{ where } \pi(k) + 1 < \pi(k+1) \text{ for } 1 \le k < r \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

(a) Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \{\pi : (1, \ldots, r) \to (1, \ldots, n) | \pi(k) + 1 < \pi(k+1) \text{ for } 1 \le k < r\} \\ = & \{\pi : (1, \ldots, r) \to (1, \ldots, n) | \pi(k) + 1 < \pi(k+1) \text{ for } 1 \le k < r \text{ and } \pi(1) = 1\} \\ & \cup \{\pi : (1, \ldots, r) \to (1, \ldots, n) | \pi(k) + 1 < \pi(k+1) \text{ for } 1 \le k < r \text{ and } \pi(1) \ne 1\} \\ = & \{\pi : (1, \ldots, r-1) \to (3, \ldots, n) | \pi(k) + 1 < \pi(k+1) \text{ for } 1 \le k < r-1\} \\ & \cup \{\pi : (1, \ldots, r) \to (2, \ldots, n) | \pi(k) + 1 < \pi(k+1) \text{ for } 1 \le k < r\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $S_r(a_1, \ldots, a_n, 0) = S_r(a_2, \ldots, a_n, 0) + a_1 S_{r-1}(a_3, \ldots, a_n, 0)$.

(b) By definition, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&S_r(a_1,\ldots,a_n,0)-S_r(a_1,\ldots,a_n)\\
=\ &\sum\left\{\prod_{k=1}^{r}a_{\pi(k)}|\pi:(1,\ldots,r)\to(1,\ldots,n),\pi(k)+1<\pi(k+1),1\le k<r,\pi(1)=1,\pi(r)=n\right\}\\
=\ &\sum\left\{a_1a_n\prod_{k=2}^{r-1}a_{\pi(k)}|\pi:(2,\ldots,r-1)\to(3,\ldots,n-2),\pi(k)+1<\pi(k+1),2\le k<r-1\right\}\\
=\ &a_1a_n\sum\left\{\prod_{k=1}^{r-2}a_{\alpha(k)}|\alpha:(1,\ldots,r-2)\to(3,\ldots,n-2),\alpha(k)+1<\alpha(k+1),1\le k<r-2\right\}\\
=\ &a_1a_nS_{r-2}(a_3,\ldots,a_{n-2},0)
\end{aligned}$$

as asserted. ■

For an n-by-n matrix A, consider the degree-n homogeneous polynomial $p_A(x,y,z)=\det(x\mathrm{Re}\,A+y\mathrm{Im}\,A+zI_n)$, where $\mathrm{Re}\,A=(A+A^*)/2$ and $\mathrm{Im}\,A=(A-A^*)/(2i)$. A result of Kippenhahn [3, Theorem 10] says that the numerical range $W(A)$ equals the convex hull of the real points in the dual of the curve $p_A(x,y,z)=0$, that is,

$$W(A)=\{a+ib\in\mathbb{C}:a,b\text{ real},\ ax+by+z=0\text{ tangent to }p_A(x,y,z)=0\}^\wedge.$$

Here, for any subset $\triangle$ of $\mathbb{C}$, $\triangle^\wedge$ denote its convex hull, that is, $\triangle^\wedge$ is the smallest convex set containing $\triangle$. Therefore, the numerical range $W(A)$ is completely determined by the Kippenhahn polynomial $p_A(x,y,z)$.

The next theorem gives the expansion of the Kippenhahn polynomial $p_A(x,y,z)$ of an n-by-n weighted shift matrix A in terms of its weights.

Theorem 4.2. *Let A be an n-by-n $(n\ge 3)$ weighted shift matrix with weights* $a_1,\ldots,a_n$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
p_A(x,y,z)\ =\ &z^n+\sum_{r=1}^{\lfloor\frac{n}{2}\rfloor}S_r(|a_1|^2,\ldots,|a_n|^2)(x^2+y^2)^r(-\frac{1}{4})^r z^{n-2r}\\
&+\frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{2^n}\left((x-iy)^n\prod_{j=1}^{n}a_j+(x+iy)^n\prod_{j=1}^{n}\bar{a}_j\right).
\end{aligned}$$

For the proof of Theorem 4.2, we need the next two lemmas. The first lemma is an immediate consequence of the result of Stout [7, Lemma 1].

Lemma 4.3. *Let A be an n-by-n weighted shift matrix with weights $a_1, \ldots, a_{n-1}, 0$. Then*

$$\det(zI_n + \mathrm{Re}\, A) = \sum_{r=0}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} S_r(|a_1|^2, \ldots, |a_{n-1}|^2, 0)(-\frac{1}{4})^r z^{n-2r}.$$

Lemma 4.4. *Let A be an n-by-n weighted shift matrix with weights $a_1, \ldots, a_{n-1}, 0$. Then*

$$\det(x\mathrm{Re}\, A + y\mathrm{Im}\, A + zI_n) = \sum_{r=0}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} S_r(|a_1|^2, \ldots, |a_{n-1}|^2, 0)(x^2+y^2)^r(-\frac{1}{4})^r z^{n-2r}.$$

Proof. Let $\tilde{A}$ be the n-by-n weighted shift matrix with weights $a_1(x-iy), a_2(x-iy), \ldots, a_{n-1}(x-iy), 0$. It is easily seen that $\mathrm{Re}\, \tilde{A} = x\mathrm{Re}\, A + y\mathrm{Im}\, A$. Therefore, by Lemma 4.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \det(x\mathrm{Re}\, A + y\mathrm{Im}\, A + zI_n) \\
= \;& \det(zI_n + \mathrm{Re}\, \tilde{A}) \\
= \;& \sum_{r=0}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} S_r(|a_1|^2(x^2+y^2), \ldots, |a_{n-1}|^2(x^2+y^2), 0)(-\frac{1}{4})^r z^{n-2r} \\
= \;& \sum_{r=0}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} S_r(|a_1|^2, \ldots, |a_{n-1}|^2, 0)(x^2+y^2)^r(-\frac{1}{4})^r z^{n-2r}
\end{aligned}$$

as asserted. ■

We are now ready to prove Theorem 4.2. For simplicity, let $A[i_1, \ldots, i_m]$ denote the $(n-m)$-by-$(n-m)$ principal submatrix of A obtained by deleting its rows and columns indexed by $i_1, \ldots, i_m$.

Proof of Theorem 4.2. We now expand the determinant of $x\mathrm{Re}\, A + y\mathrm{Im}\, A + zI_n$

by minor along its nth column to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\det(x\mathrm{Re}\, A + y\mathrm{Im}\, A + zI_n)\\
= \ & z\det(C_1 + zI_{n-1}) + \frac{a_{n-1}}{2}(x-iy)(-1)^{2n-1}d_{n-1,n} + (-1)^{n+1}\frac{\bar{a}_n}{2}(x+iy)d_{1,n},
\end{aligned}$$

where $C_1 = x\mathrm{Re}\, A[n] + y\mathrm{Im}\, A[n]$ and $(-1)^{n+j}d_{j,n}$ denotes the cofactor of the (j,n)-entry of $x\mathrm{Re}\, A + y\mathrm{Im}\, A + zI_n$ in $x\mathrm{Re}\, A + y\mathrm{Im}\, A + zI_n$, $j = 1, n-1$. The expansion of the determinant $d_{1,n}$ (resp., $d_{n-1,n}$) along its last row (resp., its last column) yields

$$d_{1,n} = \bar{a}_1 \cdots \bar{a}_{n-1}(\frac{x+iy}{2})^{n-1} + (-1)^n \frac{a_n}{2}(x-iy)\det(C_2 + zI_{n-2})$$

$$(\text{resp.}, d_{n-1,n} = (-1)^n a_1 \cdots a_{n-2}a_n(\frac{x-iy}{2})^{n-1} + \frac{\bar{a}_{n-1}}{2}(x+iy)\det(C_3 + zI_{n-2})),$$

where $C_2 = x\mathrm{Re}\, A[1,n] + y\mathrm{Im}\, A[1,n]$ (resp., $C_3 = x\mathrm{Re}\, A[n-1,n] + y\mathrm{Im}\, A[n-1,n]$). Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
&\det(x\mathrm{Re}\, A + y\mathrm{Im}\, A + zI_n)\\
= \ & z\det(C_1 + zI_{n-1}) - \frac{|a_{n-1}|^2}{4}(x^2+y^2)\det(C_3 + zI_{n-2}) - \frac{|a_n|^2}{4}(x^2+y^2)\det(C_2 + zI_{n-2})\\
&+(-1)^{n+1}\bar{a}_1 \cdots \bar{a}_n(\frac{x+iy}{2})^n + (-1)^{n+1}a_1 \cdots a_n(\frac{x-iy}{2})^n.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.4, we obtain that

$$z\det(C_1 + zI_{n-1}) = \sum_{r=0}^{\lfloor (n-1)/2 \rfloor} S_r(|a_1|^2, \ldots, |a_{n-2}|^2, 0)(x^2+y^2)^r(\frac{-1}{4})^r z^{n-2r}.$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}
&-\frac{|a_n|^2}{4}(x^2+y^2)\det(C_2 + zI_{n-2})\\
= \ & \sum_{r=0}^{\lfloor (n-2)/2 \rfloor} |a_n|^2 S_r(|a_2|^2, \ldots, |a_{n-2}|^2, 0)(x^2+y^2)^{r+1}(\frac{-1}{4})^{r+1}z^{n-2-2r}\\
= \ & \sum_{r=1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} |a_n|^2 S_{r-1}(|a_2|^2, \ldots, |a_{n-2}|^2, 0)(x^2+y^2)^r(\frac{-1}{4})^r z^{n-2r},
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{|a_{n-1}|^2}{4}(x^2+y^2)\det(C_3+zI_{n-2}) \\
= & \sum_{r=0}^{\lfloor (n-2)/2 \rfloor} |a_{n-1}|^2 S_r(|a_1|^2,\ldots,|a_{n-3}|^2,0)(x^2+y^2)^{r+1}(\frac{-1}{4})^{r+1} z^{n-2-2r} \\
= & \sum_{r=1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} |a_{n-1}|^2 S_{r-1}(|a_1|^2,\ldots,|a_{n-3}|^2,0)(x^2+y^2)^{r}(\frac{-1}{4})^{r} z^{n-2r}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that if n is odd, then $\lfloor (n-1)/2 \rfloor = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$. On the other hand, if n is even, then $n/2 > (n-1)/2$ and, by Equation (4.2), we have

$$0 = S_{n/2}(|a_1|^2,\ldots,|a_{n-2}|^2,0) = S_{(n/2)-1}(|a_2|^2,\ldots,|a_{n-2}|^2,0) = S_{(n/2)-1}(|a_1|^2,\ldots,|a_{n-3}|^2,0).$$

Therefore, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \det(x\mathrm{Re}\, A + y\mathrm{Im}\, A + zI_n) \\
= & z^n + \sum_{r=1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} \alpha_r (x^2+y^2)^r(-\frac{1}{4})^r z^{n-2r} + \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{2^n}\left((x-iy)^n \prod_{j=1}^{n} a_j + (x+iy)^n \prod_{j=1}^{n} \bar{a}_j\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_r = & S_r(|a_1|^2,\ldots,|a_{n-2}|^2,0) + |a_{n-1}|^2 S_{r-1}(|a_1|^2,\ldots,|a_{n-3}|^2,0) \\
& +|a_n|^2 S_{r-1}(|a_2|^2,\ldots,|a_{n-2}|^2,0).
\end{aligned}$$

for $r = 1,\ldots,\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$. We then apply Equation (4.5) and Proposition 4.1 (a) and (b) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_r = & S_r(|a_1|^2,\ldots,|a_{n-1}|^2,0) + |a_n|^2 S_{r-1}(|a_2|^2,\ldots,|a_{n-2}|^2,0) \\
= & S_r(|a_1|^2,\ldots,|a_{n-1}|^2,0) + |a_n|^2 S_{r-1}(|a_1|^2,\ldots,|a_{n-2}|^2,0) \\
& -|a_1|^2|a_n|^2 S_{r-2}(|a_3|^2,\ldots,|a_{n-2}|^2,0) \\
= & S_r(|a_1|^2,\ldots,|a_n|^2,0) - |a_1|^2|a_n|^2 S_{r-2}(|a_3|^2,\ldots,|a_{n-2}|^2,0) \\
= & S_r(|a_1|^2,\ldots,|a_n|^2)
\end{aligned}$$

for $r = 1,2,\ldots,\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$. This completes the proof. ■

We now restrict our attention to the Kippenhahn polynomial of a weighted shift matrix. Let us recall some other known properties of curves in the complex projective plane $\mathbb{C}P^2$. Let $p(x, y, z)$ be a degree-n homogeneous polynomial and Γ be the dual curve of $p(x, y, z) = 0$. It is clear that $p(\alpha x, \alpha y, \alpha z) = \alpha^n p(x, y, z)$ for some scalar α. A point $\lambda = a + ib$, a, b real, is called a *real focus* of Γ if $p(1, \pm i, -(a \pm ib)) = 0$ is satisfied. Consequently, the eigenvalues of an n-by-n matrix T are exactly the real foci of the dual curve of $p_T = 0$ (cf. [3, Theorem 11]). Moreover, for any $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, since $\mathrm{Re}\,(e^{i\theta}T) = (\cos\theta)\mathrm{Re}\,T - (\sin\theta)\mathrm{Im}\,T$ and $\mathrm{Im}\,(e^{i\theta}T) = (\cos\theta)\mathrm{Im}\,T + (\sin\theta)\mathrm{Re}\,T$, then

$$\begin{aligned} p_{e^{i\theta}T}(x, y, z) &= \det\left((x\cos\theta + y\sin\theta)\mathrm{Re}\,T + (-x\sin\theta + y\cos\theta)\mathrm{Im}\,T + zI_n\right) \\ &= p_T(x\cos\theta + y\sin\theta, -x\sin\theta + y\cos\theta, z). \end{aligned}$$

Among other things, if A and B are n-by-n matrices so that A is unitary equivalent to B, then $p_A(x, y, z) = p_B(x, y, z)$.

Let A be an n-by-n weighted shift matrix with weights $a_1, \ldots, a_n$. Lemma 2.1 (b) says that A is unitarily equivalent to $\omega_n^j A$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n$, where $\omega_n = e^{2\pi i/n}$. Thus $p_A(x, y, z) = p_{\omega_n^j A}(x, y, z)$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n$. Furthermore, if A is reducible, Theorem 3.1 says that A is unitarily equivalent to $B \oplus (\omega_n B) \oplus \cdots \oplus (\omega_n^{(n/k)-1} B)$, where B is the k-by-k weighted shift matrix with weights $|a_1|e^{i\theta}, \ldots, |a_k|e^{i\theta}$, k is a factor of n and $\theta = (\sum_{i=1}^n \arg a_j)/n$. Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned} p_A(x, y, z) &= \prod_{j=0}^{(n/k)-1} p_{\omega_n^j B}(x, y, z) \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^{n/k} p_B(x\cos\theta_j + y\sin\theta_j, -x\sin\theta_j + y\cos\theta_j, z) \end{aligned}$$

where $\theta_j = 2(j-1)\pi/n$ for $j = 1, \ldots, n/k$. For an n-by-n matrix T, we known that if T is reducible then p_T is also reducible. But the converse is not true in general. The next proposition shows that if p_A is reducible then p_A must be of the form described above.

Proposition 4.5. *Let A be an n-by-n $(n \geq 2)$ weighted shift matrix. If p_A is reducible and has an irreducible factor $q(x, y, z)$ of degree-k, then n is divisible by k, and*

$$p_A(x, y, z) = \prod_{j=1}^{n/k} q(x\cos\theta_j + y\sin\theta_j, -x\sin\theta_j + y\cos\theta_j, z),$$

where $\theta_j = 2(j-1)\pi/n$ for $j = 1, \ldots, n/k$.

Proof. For abbreviation, we let

$$q_j(x, y, z) = q(x\cos\theta_j + y\sin\theta_j, -x\sin\theta_j + y\cos\theta_j, z)$$

for $j = 1, \ldots, n$. Note that $q_1(x, y, z) = q(x, y, z)$. We first check that $q_j(x, y, z)$ is a factor of $p_A(x, y, z)$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n$. Indeed, since q is a factor of p_A, then $p_A(x, y, z) = q(x, y, z)r(x, y, z)$ for some homogeneous polynomial $r(x, y, z)$. Note that A is unitarily equivalent to $e^{i\theta_j}A$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n$, hence

$$\begin{aligned}
& p_A(x, y, z) \\
= \;& p_{e^{i\theta_j}A}(x, y, z) \\
= \;& p_A(x\cos\theta_j + y\sin\theta_j, -x\sin\theta_j + y\cos\theta_j, z) \\
= \;& q(x\cos\theta_j + y\sin\theta_j, -x\sin\theta_j + y\cos\theta_j, z)r(x\cos\theta_j + y\sin\theta_j, -x\sin\theta_j + y\cos\theta_j, z), \\
= \;& q_j(x, y, z)r(x\cos\theta_j + y\sin\theta_j, -x\sin\theta_j + y\cos\theta_j, z)
\end{aligned}$$

for all $1 \leq j \leq n$. Therefore, q_j is a factor of p_A for all $1 \leq j \leq n$.

Next, we want to show that n is divisible by k. For each $j = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, let Γ_j be the dual curve of $q_j(x, y, z) = 0$ and E_j be the set of all real foci of Γ_j. We claim that $E_j = e^{i\theta_j}E_1$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n$. Indeed, if $\lambda = a + ib \in E_1$, where a and b are real, then $e^{i\theta_j}\lambda = (a\cos\theta_j - b\sin\theta_j) + i(a\sin\theta_j + b\cos\theta_j)$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
& q_j(1, \pm i, -((a\cos\theta_j - b\sin\theta_j) \pm i(a\sin\theta_j + b\cos\theta_j))) \\
= \;& q(\cos\theta_j \pm i\sin\theta_j, -\sin\theta_j \pm i\cos\theta_j, -(\cos\theta_j \pm i\sin\theta_j)(a \pm ib)) \\
= \;& (\cos\theta_j \pm \sin\theta_j)^k \cdot q(1, \pm i, -(a \pm ib)) = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that every real focus of Γ_j is an eigenvalue of A, and every eigenvalue of A is simple, it follows that all real foci of Γ_j are distinct. Hence $E_j = e^{i\theta_j}E_1$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n$ as claimed. Moreover, for any $1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$, if $q_i \neq q_j$, since p_A is divisible by q_iq_j and the eigenvalue of A is simple, it implies that $E_i \cap E_j = \emptyset$. Therefore, we conclude that either $E_i = E_j$ or $E_i \cap E_j = \emptyset$ for any $1 \leq i < j \leq n$.

Now, if $E_1 \cap E_j = \emptyset$ for all $2 \leq j \leq n$, we will prove $E_s \cap E_t = \emptyset$ for any $1 \leq s < t \leq n$. On the contrary, if $E_s = E_t$ for some s, t, since $E_s = e^{i\theta_s}E_1$ and $E_t = e^{i\theta_t}E_1$, it follows that $e^{i\theta_s}E_1 = e^{i\theta_t}E_1$ or $E_1 = e^{i(\theta_t-\theta_s)}E_1 = e^{i\theta_{t-s+1}}E_1 = E_{t-s+1}$, a contraction. Hence these sets E_j's are disjoint. Note that $E_j \subseteq \sigma(A)$ and E_j contains exactly k elements for all $1 \leq j \leq n$. Thus $\bigcup_{j=1}^n E_j \subseteq \sigma(A)$ and $k \cdot n \leq n$. This clearly forces that $k = 1$ and $\sigma(A) = \bigcup_{j=1}^n E_j$, that is, $p_A = \Pi_{j=1}^n q_j$ as desired.

On the other hand, if $E_1 = E_j$ for some j, $2 \leq j \leq n$. Let $j_0 = \min\{j : E_j = E_1, 2 \leq j \leq n\}$ and $m = j_0 - 1$. Then $E_{m+1} = E_1$, in consequence, $E_{m+j} = E_j$ for all $2 \leq j \leq n$, because $E_{m+j} = e^{i\theta_{m+j}}E_1 = e^{2(m+j-1)\pi i/n}E_1 = e^{2(j-1)\pi i/n} \cdot e^{2m\pi i/n}E_1 = e^{i\theta_j} \cdot e^{i\theta_{m+1}}E_1 = e^{i\theta_j}E_{m+1} = e^{i\theta_j}E_1 = E_j$. From this, we have $\bigcup_{j=1}^n E_j = \bigcup_{j=1}^m E_j \subseteq \sigma(A)$. But $\sigma(A) = \left\{e^{i\theta_1}\lambda, e^{i\theta_2}\lambda, \ldots, e^{i\theta_n}\lambda\right\}$, where $\lambda = (a_1 \cdots a_n)^{1/n}$. It follows that $\sigma(A) \subseteq \bigcup_{j=1}^n e^{i\theta_j}E_1 = \bigcup_{j=1}^n E_j = \bigcup_{j=1}^m E_j \subseteq \sigma(A)$. Hence $\sigma(A) = \bigcup_{j=1}^m E_j$, $n = km$ and $p_A = \prod_{j=1}^m q_j$. This completes the proof. ■

Let A and B be n-by-n matrices. By Kippenhahn's result [3, Theorem 10], we known that if $p_A = p_B$ then $W(A) = W(B)$. But the converse is not true in general. [1, Example 2.1] gives a counterexample. For the converse, if $W(A) = W(B)$, then [1, Proposition 2.3] says that p_A and p_B have a common irreducible factor. Moreover, if p_A is reducible, then $W(A) = W(B)$ if and only if $p_A = p_B$ (cf. [1, Corollary 2.4]). Now, if A and B are n-by-n weighted shift matrices, the next theorem shows that $W(A) = W(B)$ if and only if $p_A = p_B$, even if p_A and p_B are reducible.

Theorem 4.6. *Let A and B be n-by-n weighted shift matrices with weights*

$a_1, \ldots, a_n$ *and* $b_1, \ldots, b_n$*, respectively. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

(a) $W(A) = W(B)$,

(b) $p_A = p_B$,

(c) $S_r(|a_1|^2, \ldots, |a_n|^2) = S_r(|b_1|^2, \ldots, |b_n|^2)$ *for all* $1 \le r \le \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ *and* $a_1 \cdots a_n = b_1 \cdots b_n$.

Proof. The equivalence of (b) and (c) follows from Theorem 4.2. The implication (b)⇒(a) is a consequence of Kippehhahn's result. To prove (a)⇒(b), assume that (a) holds. If p_A is irreducible, then $p_A = p_B$ follows from [1, Corollary 2.4]. If p_A is reducible, [1, Proposition 2.3] says that p_A and p_B have a common irreducible factor q. Hence our assertion follows form Proposition 4.5. This completes the proof. $\blacksquare$

Let A be an n-by-n weighted shift matrix with positive weights $a_1, \ldots, a_n$. Since all a_j's are positive, thus $W(A) = W(A^*)$. Let B be an n-by-n weighted shift matrix with positive weights $b_1, \ldots, b_n$. If $b_j = a_{k+j}$ for all j, for some fixed k, then B is unitarily equivalent to A and $W(B) = W(A)$. On the other hand, if $b_j = a_{(n+1)-j}$ for all j, then B is unitarily equivalent to A^* and $W(B) = W(A^*) = W(A)$. For the converse, if $W(B) = W(A)$, it is natural to ask whether B is unitarily equivalent to A or A^*. The following example shows that this is not the case. This example can be easily constructed by Theorem 4.6.

Example 4.7. Let

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & \\ & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \\ \frac{\sqrt{30}}{4} & & 0 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \sqrt{2} & \\ & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \\ \frac{\sqrt{10}}{4} & & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Form Theorem 4.6, we need to check that $\det A = \det B$ and $S_1(1^2, (\sqrt{2}/2)^2, (\sqrt{30}/4)^2) = S_1((\sqrt{2})^2, (\sqrt{3}/2)^2, (\sqrt{10}/4)^2)$. By direct computation, we have $\det A = \sqrt{60}/4 = \det B$ and $S_1(1^2, (\sqrt{2}/2)^2, (\sqrt{30}/4)^2) = 2 + (1/2) + (30/16) = 27/8 = 2 + (3/4) + (10/16) = S_1((\sqrt{2})^2, (\sqrt{3}/2)^2, (\sqrt{10}/4)^2)$. Therefore, Theorem 4.6 yields that $W(A) =$

$W(B)$. But B is neither unitarily equivalent to A nor unitarily equivalent to A^* from Theorem 2.3.

Furthermore, let A and B be n-by-n reducible weighted shift matrices with positive weights. One may ask whether B is unitarily equivalent to A or A^* if $W(A) = W(B)$. The next example shows that the answer is negative.

Example 4.8. Let A and B be the 3-by-3 weighted shift matrices as in Example 4.7, respectively, and $\tilde{A}$ and $\tilde{B}$ be 6-by-6 weighted shift matrices with weights1, $\sqrt{2}/2$, $\sqrt{30}/4, 1, \sqrt{2}/2, \sqrt{30}/4$ and $\sqrt{2}$, $\sqrt{3}/2$, $\sqrt{10}/4$, $\sqrt{2}$, $\sqrt{3}/2$, $\sqrt{10}/4$, respectively. By Theorem 3.1, $\tilde{A}$ (resp., $\tilde{B}$) is unitarily equivalent to $A \oplus (e^{\pi i/3}A)$ (resp., $B \oplus (e^{\pi i/3}B)$). Example 4.7 yields that $W(\tilde{A}) = W(\tilde{B})$. But $\tilde{B}$ is neither unitarily equivalent to $\tilde{A}$ nor unitarily equivalent to $\tilde{A}^*$ from Theorem 2.3.

References

[1] H.-L. Gau and P. Y. Wu, Companion matrices: reducibility, numerical ranges and similarity to contractions, Linear Algebra Appl. 383 (2004) 127–142.

[2] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson, Topics in Matrix Analysis, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1991.

[3] R. Kippenhahn, Über den Wertevorrat einer Matrix, Math. Nachr. 6 (1951) 193–228. (English translation: P. F. Zachin and M. E. Hochstenbach, On the numerical range of a matrix, Linear and Multilinear Algebra 56 (2008) 185–225.)

[4] C.-K. Li and N.-K. Tsing, Matrices with circular symmetry on their unitary orbits and C-numerical ranges, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 111 (1991) 19–28.

[5] M.-C. Tsai, Numerical ranges of weighted shift matrices with periodic weights, Linear Algebra Appl. 435 (2011) 2296–2302.

[6] M.-C. Tsai and P. Y. Wu, Numerical ranges of weighted shift matrices, Linear Algebra Appl. 435 (2011) 243–254.

[7] Q. F. Stout, The numerical range of a weighted shift, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 88 (1983) 495–502.